

U.S. Application Serial No. 10/749,819

REMARKS

The present amendment is in response to the Official Action dated November 18, 2005, in which the Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 8-14 and 16-21 as being unpatentable over Selby, US Patent No. 4,876,738, in view of one or more of Purnadi et al., US Patent No. 6,708,031; Frid et al., US Patent No. 6,560,239; and Dent et al., US Patent No. 6,542,716.

The applicant has reviewed the Examiner's response to applicants' argument, and believes the present areas of contention are focused in a couple of areas, a first set of arguments directed to the rejection of independent claims 1 and 12, and the corresponding dependent claims, and a second set of arguments directed to the rejection of newly independent claim 11, both of which will be addressed separately below. For simplicity sake, the applicant will focus on the corresponding independent claims, recognizing that should the independent claims be shown to be distinguishable relative to the references relied upon in support of the objection, then the same analysis would be equally applicable to any corresponding dependent claims. However, it should be noted that the present rejection of at least dependent claims 2, 8 and 17-20, appears to be defective, in so far as the examiner relies upon Selby, '738, as making known the features of parent claim 1, despite the fact that the Examiner has amended his rejection of claim 1 to additionally rely upon Dent et al., '716, for support.

Regarding the drawings, the applicants appreciate the identification of the typographical error in the proposed set of formal drawings and understand that the present prosecution of the application will proceed based upon the originally filed set of informal drawings until a further set of formal drawings, which corrects the noted deficiency is filed.

With respect to the first of the two areas noted above with respect to the claims, the Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 12 as being unpatentable over Selby, '738, in view of Dent et al., '716. Originally, it appeared to the applicants that the Examiner was attempting to equate the alleged paging groups of Dent et al., '716, with the alleged different communication areas of Selby, '738. However, in response to applicants' arguments, the Examiner appears to be suggesting that the two different registrations systems could remain separate, but co-exist, and in their independent operation, satisfy different features of the claims. However, such a view appears to ignore the claimed relationship (i.e. association) between the new area and the paging group, where upon entering a new area, if the new area has an association with a different paging

U.S. Application Serial No. 10/749,819


group from the paging group associated with the immediately prior communication area, then a registration takes place regardless as to whether a registration from a prior presence in the new communication area is retained. If the two different types of areas merely geographically co-exist, and they are otherwise separate (i.e. have separate registration methods associated with separate systems), then there would be no association to check to determine if a registration should take place under the claimed condition. As a result, the Examiner's rejection as presently explained does not make known each and every feature of claims 1 and 12, and therefore fails to make known or obvious the same, as well as their respective dependent claims.

The Examiner's attempted combination relative to the second of the two areas, corresponding to claim 11, which includes a discarding of previously stored registrations upon a change in power state, is equally problematic, in so far as the two types of information referred to in the two relied upon references are very different. A registration record is not the same as a short textual SMS paging message. Still further the action upon power up referred to by Lawrence, US Patent No. 6,628,935, relates to a deactivation of an associated status indicator, namely the memory exceeded indicator, and contrary to the assertions of the Examiner does not relate to any deletion of messages upon power up/down, or more importantly a discarding of a registration record. Correspondingly, the teachings of the supplemental reference as presently articulated and relied upon are irrelevant to the presently claimed circumstances. Furthermore, relative to the teachings of Selhy, '738, a mobile station moving out of communication range can not be equated to a power up/down condition, and therefore the same can not be said to make known or obvious claim 11.

In view of the above noted analysis, the presently articulated rejections can not be maintained, and in absence of a valid rejection, the claims should be correspondingly allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

Motorola, Inc.
Intellectual Property Department
600 North US Highway 45, RM AS437
Libertyville, IL 60048

BY: 
Lawrence J. Chapa
Reg. No. 39,135
Phone (847) 523-0340
Fax. No. (847) 523-2350